

Sherman May Consulting, Inc.

2622 Bayview Dr.
Alameda, CA 94501
Phone: 510-915-2415

July 22, 2005

Attn: Paul Dabbs, Chief
Water Resources Evaluation Section
Statewide Water Planning Branch
California Department of Water Resources
PO Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Subject: Desalination

Desalination is now being recognized as an economic and valuable new water supply. Previous Water Plans have shown little likelihood for desalination being a major water source. Thanks to the efforts of the California Desalination Task Force in 2002, the future role for desalination has been more clearly recognized by California.

Upon review of the draft Report, some specific comments are:

1. Desalination Plants Planned (V2, page 6-3) Desalination will provide a much large supply than shown in the Report. The estimated planned desalination supply is based upon information from 2002 which is all ready out-of-date. Since that time, Regional Integrated Water Plans have been published by some of the major water suppliers. In addition, \$25 million from Proposition 50 has been allotted to several desalination projects. The Report's Table on page 6-3 shows an estimated supply from seawater desalination as 187,100 AF/year by 2030. More likely, the value will exceed 400,000 by 2025 as noted in the attachment (this only considers seawater desalination). Using the Reports methodology of doubling what is know, than Figure 1-1 (V2, page 1-5) should be more than double for desalination. Note additional effort is required to identify the brackish desalination capacity.

2. Energy Use-(V2, Page 6-5) Energy cost continues to be reduced. The energy requirements are typically high, if not the highest, cost component of seawater desalted water. It should be noted that a current project sponsored by the Affordable Desalination Coalition is expected to demonstrate lower energy requirements of half the amount given in the report (only 15 MW would be required for the 50 MGD plant rather than the 33 MW shown). Additionally, it should be recognized that all water processes require energy. For example, the Demonstration Project is expected to show seawater desalination will use less energy than currently required to transport water through the State Water Project.

3. **Growth-inducing Impacts**-(V2, pg 6-5) Why should desalination be singled out as growth-inducing? Conservation and water reuse should either be classified as growth-inducing or this description should be eliminated from the desalination section.

Sincerely,

Sherman May

ATTACHMENT

SEAWATER DESALINATION POTENTIAL

MWD Integrated Water Plan (2025)	AF/YR	Source
Seawater Desalination-Various Sites	126000	Volume 3, page 5-14
OTHER PLANNED PROJECTS		Source
Cambria	481	Coastal Commission
Santa Cruz	2800	Coastal Commission
Monterey Peninsula	10000	Coastal Commission
Marin Municipal Water District	12000	10-15 MGD
Eastern Municipal Water District		Prop 50 (probably brackish)
City of San Diego (San Pasqual)		Prop 50
Coachella Valley Water District		Prop 50
San Benito County Water		Prop 50
East Bay Municipal Water District-Regional Plan	138000	Prop 50
City of San Diego (Brackish GW)		Prop 50
San Diego County Water-San Onofre		Prop 50-Seawater
Western Municipal District (Arlington)		Prop 50
East Niles Community Service District		Prop 50
Montara Water and Sanitary District		Prop 50-Seawater
TOTAL	289281	
Other projects	139000	See notes below
TOTAL THROUGH ABOUT 2025	428281	

NOTES: Other Additions to the MWD IRP

1. San Diego County Water Authority expects between 50 and 140 thousand AF/yr by 2025. The MWD Plan attributes 56,000 AF/yr to San Diego. Thus there is a range addition of 84,000 AF/yr for San Diego along. Others districts will add to this. Ref: Desalination Workshop 4/16/2004 by Bernie Rhinerson

2. Huntington Beach at 55,000 AF/yr is not included in MWD IRP but shown in Coastal Commission report